### **EXHIBIT 1**

### **EXHIBIT 1**

**SUMM** 

## **District Court**

ORIGINAL

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

KEVIN CARTER, MICHAEL SACCO, and BLAKE RECK individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs.

VS.

WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,

Defendant.

Case No. A-16-740621-C Dept. No. XXVII

**SUMMONS** 

GRIEF SON CLARK

Deputy Clerk

County Courthouse

200 South Third Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

NOTICE! YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. THE COURT MAY DECIDE AGAINST YOU WITHOUT YOUR BEING HEARD UNLESS YOU RESPOND WITHIN 20 DAYS. READ THE INFORMATION BELOW.

TO THE DEFENDANT: A Civil Complaint has been filed by the plaintiff against you for the relief set forth in the Complaint.

#### WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC c/o Roxane Peper

- 1. If you intend to defend this lawsuit, within 20 days after this Summons is served on you exclusive of the day of service, you must do the following:
- a. File with the Clerk of this Court, whose address is shown below, a formal written response to the Complaint in accordance with the rules of the Court.
  - b. Serve a copy of your response upon the attorney whose name and address is shown below.
- 2. Unless you respond, your default will be entered upon application of the plaintiff and this Court may enter a judgment against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint, which could result in the taking of money or property or other relief requested in the Complaint.

3. If you intend to seek the advice of an attorney in this matter, you should do so promptly so that your response may be filed on time.

Issued at the request of:

Christian Gabroy Nevada Bar No. 8805

170 S. Green Valley Parkway, Suite 280

Henderson, Nevada 89012

Attorney for Plaintiff

\*NOTE:

When service is by publication, add a brief statement of the object of the action.

See Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4(b).

STATE	E OF	)					
COUN	TY OF	) ss: )	Å	FFIDAVIT OF	SERVICE		
affidav	tizen of the United States, over tit is made. That affiant	t received	age, not a	party to or inte	erested in th of the S	e proceeding ummons ar	g in which this and Complaint,
	(aff	iant must com	plete the ap	propriate para	graph)		
1.	at (state address)			сору			,
2. copy w defend	serving the defendant with dant's usual plac				_ by persona	ally delivering Id discretion (state	g and leaving a residing at the address)
		agraph 3 for se	rvice upon	agent, complet	ting A or B)		
3. copy	serving the defendant	at		(state	_ by persona	ally delivering	and leaving a address)
Iawfull	a. with ly designated by			as		1000 B P 107 B 1 A 107 B 1	, an agent
shown 4.	n of suitable age and discretion on the current certificate of compersonally depositing a copy ge prepaid (check appropriate roughly mail Certified mail, Registered mail	lesignation filed in a mail box method):	d with the S of the Unit	ecretary of Sta	ate.		
	addressed to the defendant				at the defer	ndant's last l	known address address)
which	Executed this d	is ay of, 20_		(state	aking service	<b>.</b>	dooroos
SUBS	CRIBED AND SWORN to befor	e me this					
(	day of, 20	16.					
NOTA and St	RY PUBLIC in and for said Coutate	unty					
Му со	mmission expires:						

SUMM

### **District Court**

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

KEVIN CARTER, MICHAEL SACCO, and BLAKE RECK individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,

Defendant.



Case No. A-16-740621-C Dept. No. XXVII

**SUMMONS** 

NOTICE! YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. THE COURT MAY DECIDE AGAINST YOU WITHOUT YOUR BEING HEARD UNLESS YOU RESPOND WITHIN 20 DAYS. READ THE INFORMATION BELOW.

TO THE DEFENDANT: A Civil Complaint has been filed by the plaintiff against you for the relief set forth in the Complaint.

#### WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC c/o Roxane Peper

- 1. If you intend to defend this lawsuit, within 20 days after this Summons is served on you exclusive of the day of service, you must do the following:
- a. File with the Clerk of this Court, whose address is shown below, a formal written response to the Complaint in accordance with the rules of the Court.
  - b. Serve a copy of your response upon the attorney whose name and address is shown below.
- 2. Unless you respond, your default will be entered upon application of the plaintiff and this Court may enter a judgment against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint, which could result in the taking of money or property or other relief requested in the Complaint.
- 3. If you intend to seek the advice of an attorney in this matter, you should do so promptly so that your response may be filed on time.

Issued at the request of:

Christian Gabroy Nevada Bar No. 8805

170 S. Green Valley Parkway, Suite 280

Henderson, Nevada 89012

Attorney for Plaintiff

STEVEN D. GRIERSC

Deputy Clerk

County Courthouse 200 South Third Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

\*NOTE:

When service is by publication, add a brief statement of the object of the action. See Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4(b).

STATE	E OF		)					
COUN	TY OF		) ss: )	· A	FFIDAVIT OF	SERVICE		
				haima data	<del>-</del>	h - a - a - 11 at		
affidav	tizen of the United State vit is made. That day of	es, over 18 affiant re	Byears of a ceived	age, not a p	copy(ies)	rested in the of the Su	proceeding mmons and	in which this Complaint,
		(affiant	must comp	olete the app	oropriate parag	raph)		
1.	delivering and at (state address)			а		with	the	defendant 
2.	serving the defendant					by personal	ly delivering	and leaving a
copy v	vith lant's usual	nlana	, of	, a	person of suit	able age and	discretion re	esiding at the
oereno	iant 5 usuai	place	O1	anone	located	đl	State	auuress)
***************************************	(U	 se paragrap	oh 3 for sei	rvice upon a	igent, completi	ng A or B)		
3.	serving the defendant					by personal	lv deliverina :	and leaving a
сору		at	erend personal construction of the delay from the first to the delay from	Michigan berken der berkelt in der besteht der	(state	, , , ,	,	address)
•	a. with				20			an acent
lawfull	•	ted by sta	tute to acc	ept service	of process;	***************************************		, an agent
shown	b. with	te of design a copy in a riate metho	nation filed mail box	address, w with the So	ecretary of Sta	the address te.	s of the resid	ent agent as
	Certified	l mail, retu		equested t requested	·	•		
	addressed to the defer	idant			ž	at the defend	lant's last kn	own address
which	addressed to the dolor	is			(state			address)
	Executed this	day of	, 20	***************************************				
				Signature	of person mak	king service		
SUBSC	CRIBED AND SWORN to	before me	this					
d	ay of	_, 2016.						
NOTAF and Sta	RY PUBLIC in and for sai ate	d County		٠				
Му сог	mmission expires:							

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Electronically Filed 07/26/2016 11:35:39 AM

CLERK OF THE COURT

Jon R. Mower, Esq.

Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice Pending

jmower@tocounsel.com

THEODORA ORINGHER PC 535 Anton Boulevard, Ninth Floor Costa Mesa, California 92626-7109

Telephone: (714) 549-6200 Facsimile: (714) 549-6201

Christian J. Gabroy, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 8805) Oscar Peralta, Esq (Nevada Bar No. 13559)

christian@gabroy.com GABROY LAW OFFICES

170 South Green Valley Parkway, Suite 280

Henderson, NV 89012 Telephone: (702) 259-7777

Facsimile: (702) 259-7704

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

#### DISTRICT COURT

#### CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

KEVIN CARTER, MICHAEL SACCO, and BLAKE RECK individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,

Defendant.

A- 16- 740621- C Case No.

XXVIICOMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES, AND UNLAWFUL TIP POOLING 29 U.S.C. § 206; 29 U.S.C. § 203 (m); 29 CFR 531.52 and 531.54
- 2. **CONVERSION**
- 3. UNJUST ENRICHMENT

COLLECTIVE AND CLASS ACTION PURSUANT TO 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) AND NEV. R. CIV. P. 23

Plaintiffs Kevin Carter, Michael Sacco, Blake Reck, and those persons set forth in Exhibit "A" for themselves and all others similarly situated ("Plaintiffs"), allege as follows for their Complaint against Wynn Las Vegas, LLC ("Wynn" or "Defendant"):

1. Plaintiffs bring this collective and class action Complaint, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and Rule 23 of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure, to recover minimum wages and tips unlawfully withheld by Defendant while Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked as servers and bartenders for Defendant in its Tryst, Intrigue, and XS nightclubs

1017785.1.	/81370.	.05002
------------	---------	--------

(the "Nightclubs") at the Wynn and Encore Hotels and Casinos in Las Vegas, Nevada.

2. As set forth in detail below, Defendant paid bartenders and servers working in the Nightelubs ("Tipped Employees") with a tip credit that Defendant used to offset minimum wages that would otherwise be owed (referred to as the "Tipped Employee Minimum Wage"). However, Defendant engaged in illegal tip pooling and tip sharing arrangements, which included requiring Tipped Employees to share a percentage of their tips with the house or with management and other non-point of service employees who do not customarily and regularly receive tips. As a result of this unlawful mandatory tip pooling system Defendant was not permitted to apply a tip credit to its employees' wages, and those employees are thus entitled to the difference between the Tipped Employees Minimum Wage and the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour established by 29 U.S.C. § 206 ("FLSA Minimum Wage"), as well as payment of the wages and tips unlawfully taken from them by way of Defendant's unlawful tip pooling and tip transferring policies and practices, together with liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and costs, and all unpaid tips.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This action arises under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States, including, without limitation, the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 200, et seq., as well as implementing regulations of the United States Department of Labor. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §216(b) which provides that an action based on these provisions "may be maintained against any employer . . . in any federal or state court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and on behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated." Venue is proper in the District Court, Clark County, Nevada because Plaintiffs reside in Clark County and worked for Defendant in Clark County; the acts complained of occurred in Clark County, and Defendant regularly conducts business in Clark County.

# Plaintiffs Kevin Cater, Michael Sacco and Blake Reck hereby file notices of consent to joinder. Such true and correct copies of such consent is hereby attached as Exhibit "A". PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Kevin Carter is a citizen of the United States and the State of Nevada, and at all relevant times was domiciled in Clark County, Nevada. During the time period relevant to this 1017785.1/81370.05002

COMPLAINT

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Complaint, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a bartender in Defendant's XS Nightclub bar, was paid with a tip credit, and a portion of his tips was unlawfully withheld by Defendant as alleged herein.

- 5. Plaintiff Michael Sacco is a citizen of the United States and the State of Nevada, and at all relevant times was domiciled in Clark County, Nevada. During the time period relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a bartender in Defendant's XS Nightclub bar, was paid with a tip credit, and a portion of his tips was unlawfully withheld by Defendant as alleged herein.
- 6. Plaintiff Blake Reck is a citizen of the United States and the State of Nevada, and at all relevant times was domiciled in Clark County, Nevada. During the time period relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a Server Assistant in Defendant's XS Nightclub bar, was paid with a tip credit, and a portion of his tips was unlawfully withheld by Defendant as alleged herein.
- 7. Defendant Wynn Las Vegas, LLC is a limited-liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada, with its primary place of business in Las Vegas, Nevada. During all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant was doing business in Las Vegas, Nevada as the Wynn Las Vegas and Encore Resort hotels and casinos.

#### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 203(m), an employer may fulfill part of its hourly minimum wage obligation to a tipped employee with the employee's tips. This practice is known as taking a "tip credit." Section 203(m) obligates employers who take a tip credit to (1) give notice to its employees, and (2) allow its employees to retain all the tips they receive, unless such employees participate in a valid tip pool. Under Section 203(m), a tip pool is valid if it is comprised exclusively of employees who are "customarily and regularly" tipped.
- 9. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs and similarly situated Tipped Employees were required to share a percentage of their tips with management and other employees who were not at the point of service and who do not customarily and regularly receive tips ("Non-Tipped Employees") The tip-out amount to Non-Tipped Employees was changed by Wynn management

1017785.1/81370.05002

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

personnel on a periodic basis but over time ranged typically between five and twenty five percent of the Tipped Employees' pooled tips.

- Non-Tipped Employees who generally consisted of Wynn managers and executives did not actually receive the tip share as tips since they provided no point of service nor were they in a position to receive any direct tips from customers. Rather, Defendant, through its management personnel, retained and utilized a portion of the Tipped Employees tips for general business purposes, and for their own financial benefit. Retaining tips for general business purposes or to pay hourly wages of other employees does not constitute a valid tip sharing or pooling under the Department of Labor's regulations and federal and state law.
- Implementing regulations promulgated by the United States Department of Labor 11. prohibit the creation of any tip pool that violates Section 203(m). See, 29 C.F.R. § 531.52 and §531.54. Because Plaintiffs and other Tipped Employees were forced, as a condition of their employment with Defendant, to share tips with Defendant's management personnel and employees who are not regularly and customarily tipped, Defendant's tip pooling and sharing policy was and is unlawful. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the forced tip pooling practice continues to be a requirement of employment at Defendant's Nightclubs and bars up to the present.
- As a result of Defendant's unlawful tip confiscation and pooling policy, Plaintiffs and 12. other similarly situated Tipped Employees were entitled to receive the FLSA Minimum Wage and not the Tipped Employee Minimum Wage. Further, tips are the property of the employee who earns them regardless of whether or not the employer has taken a tip credit. 29 C.F.R. § 531.52 Therefore, Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees are entitled to the actual amount of tips they earned rather than the amount they were left with after Defendant's mandatory tip pooling policies and practices.

#### COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 13. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 14. Individuals similarly situated to Plaintiffs include all Tipped Employees working in the Nightclubs at any time during the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint, for whom a tip 1017785.1/81370.05002

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

28

credit was applied to their wages or a portion of their tips was withheld by Defendant and shared with Non-Tipped Employees. Defendant's policies and practices of mandatory tip pooling with management and Non-Tipped Employees applied to all point of service employees receiving tips at the Nightclubs. These similarly situated individuals who, pursuant to Plaintiffs' information and belief, collectively number over 300, are so numerous that individual joinder is impractical. The identities of all putative class members are within the knowledge of Defendant, and can be ascertained only by reference to, Defendant's records.

15. Each and every other similarly situated individual employed by Defendant has suffered the same wrongdoing, and the factual and legal basis for the claims of Plaintiffs and similarly situated Tipped Employees are similar such that their claims should be heard in one action.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 16. Plaintiffs also bring this action on behalf of themselves and a class of all other similarly situated Tipped Employees, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure and the Fair Labor Standards Act Section 16(b) as a collective action and will seek an order providing that Notice be sent to all putative members of the class providing them with information regarding this action and an opportunity to submit a consent to join with other similarly situated employees in pursuing the relief sought by this Complaint.
- 17. The proposed class is defined as all Tipped Employees working in the Nightclubs at any time during the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint for whom a tip credit was applied to their wages or a portion of their tips was withheld or otherwise confiscated by Defendant and shared with Defendant's management or other Non-Tipped Employees.
- 18. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder is impractical. The interests of justice require that these claims be litigated on a collective basis.
- 19. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class because Defendant kept, confiscated, or interfered with tips properly due to Plaintiffs and all Class members. Plaintiffs, like all Class members, have been damaged by Defendant's misconduct in that they have been, and will continue to be, deprived of property and wages by Defendant's unlawful tip pooling and tip confiscation policies. Furthermore, the factual basis of Defendant's misconduct is common to all Class

1017785.1/81370.05002

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

members, including Plaintiffs, and represents a common thread of an unlawful policy and practice resulting in similar injuries to all members of the Class.

- 20. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to the Class, and those common questions predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are whether Defendant:
  - (a) unlawfully permitted management and other employees who do not customarily and regularly receive tips to participate in the Class's mandatory tip pooling and tip confiscation practices;
  - (b) improperly interfered with the Class members' tips;
  - (c) unlawfully retained portions of the Class members' tips; and
  - (d) implemented and executed tip policies and practices that are unlawful.
- 21. Plaintiffs have suffered the harm alleged herein, have no interests antagonistic to the interests of any other Class member, are committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action, and have retained competent and experienced counsel. Therefore, Plaintiffs and their counsel are adequate representatives and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.
- 22. A collective or class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since the amount of each individual Class member's claim is small relative to the complexity of the litigation, and due to the financial resources of Defendant, no Class member could realistically afford to seek legal redress individually for the claims alleged herein. Therefore, absent a collective or class action, the Class members will continue to suffer losses, and Defendant's misconduct will proceed without remedy.
- 23. Even if Class members themselves could afford such individual litigation, this Court may become immersed in numerous lawsuits with substantially similar facts and legal issues with relatively nominal damages. Given the complex legal and factual issues involved, individualized litigation would significantly increase the delay and expense to all parties. Individualized litigation would also create the potential for inconsistent or contradictory rulings. By contrast, a class action presents far fewer management difficulties, allows claims to be heard which might otherwise go unheard because of the relative expense of bringing individual lawsuits, and provides the benefits of

б

adjudication and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### Failure to Pay Minimum Wages, 29 U.S.C. § 206 and Unlawful Mandatory Tip Sharing

- 24. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every preceding allegation in this Complaint, as if the same were fully set forth herein.
- 25. Plaintiffs have consented in writing to become a party plaintiff in this lawsuit. Plaintiffs' written consent thereto is attached as Exhibit "A" to this Complaint and incorporated herein by reference.
- 26. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant was Plaintiffs' and other similarly situated employees' employer within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Defendant is regularly engaged in interstate commerce and has revenues exceeding \$500,000.00 per annum.
- 27. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 206, Defendant was and is obligated to compensate Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees at the FLSA Minimum Wage.
- 28. Throughout the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees the FLSA Minimum Wage. Instead, Defendant applied a tip credit and paid Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees the Tipped Employee Minimum Wage. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant was not entitled to a tip credit because Plaintiffs and other Tipped Employees were required to share tips with employees who are not regularly and customarily tipped.
- 29. By failing to pay Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees the FLSA Minimum Wage and maintaining a tip pool that is not authorized by the Fair Labor Standards Act, Defendant violated and continues to violate the provisions of 29 USC § 203(m), 29 U.S.C. § 206(a)(1)(C), and 29 C.F.R. § 531.52. By forcing Plaintiffs to give up a percentage of their tips to management and Non-Tipped Employees, Defendant has ignored and violated the provisions of 29 CFR 531.52 and 531.54 and unlawfully deprived Plaintiffs of earned employment-based compensation to Plaintiffs' individual and collective detriment.
- 30. Defendant's conduct as described herein above was willful and undertaken with the intent and design to deprive Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees of their property.

1017785.1/81370.05002

- Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees have been damaged by Defendant's conduct in an amount representing the difference between the Tipped Employee Minimum Wage and the FLSA Minimum Wage, together with all tips that should have been retained by Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as earned compensation, according to proof at trial.
- 32. Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees are also entitled to liquidated damages equal to the amount of wages and tips unlawfully withheld by Defendant, together with their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 33. Defendant engaged in the aforesaid conduct willfully and with the intent to abuse its authority and economic power over Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees by taking advantage of their need for continued employment to force their acquiescence to an unlawful tip pooling and tip sharing policy. Defendant's aforesaid conduct was malicious, oppressive, and undertaken in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Therefore, Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees are entitled to an award of punitive damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

#### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### Conversion

- 34. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every preceding allegation in this Complaint, as if the same were fully set forth herein.
- 35. The tips and gratuities that customers leave for Plaintiffs and the members of the Class are Plaintiffs' and the Class members' property. 29 C.F.R. § 531.52. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have, and at all relevant times had, ownership rights and the right to possess such tips and gratuities.
- 36. Defendant retained tips and gratuities belonging to Plaintiffs and the Class members as described above, and thereby wrongfully exercised dominion and control over said tips and gratuities to the exclusion of the rights of Plaintiffs and the members of the Class.
- 37. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's wrongful exercise of dominion and control over the aforesaid tips and gratuities, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have suffered 1017785.1/81370.05002

damage in an amount according to proof at trial.

38. Defendant engaged in the aforesaid conduct willfully and with the intent to abuse its authority and economic power over Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees by taking advantage of their need for continued employment to force their acquiescence to an unlawful tip pooling and tip sharing policy. Defendant's aforesaid conduct was malicious, oppressive, and undertaken in reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Therefore, Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Tipped Employees are entitled to an award of punitive damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

#### THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### Unjust Enrichment

- 39. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by this reference each and every preceding allegation in this Complaint, as if the same were fully set forth herein.
- 40. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class conferred a benefit upon Defendant, and gave the benefit with Defendant's knowledge, by giving service to Defendant's customers, causing those customers to leave tips and gratuities for Plaintiffs and the members of the Class and creating repeat business and good will for Defendant.
  - 41. Retention of the tips and gratuities by Defendant is unjust under the circumstances.
- 42. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unjust retention of the aforesaid tips and gratuities, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have suffered damage in an amount equating to the amounts unlawfully taken from Plaintiffs and the Class and according to proof at trial.

#### PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated employees pray for judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. On the First Claim for Relief: for compensatory damages equal to the minimum wages and tips unlawfully withheld from Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated employees, and according to proof at trial; for liquidated damages in a sum equal to compensatory damages, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b); for return of the amounts unlawfully taken from the tips earned by Plaintiffs and all 1017785.1/81370,05002

COMPLAINT

other similarly situated employees; for an award of liquidated and punitive damages according to proof at trial; and for an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

- 2. On the Second Claim for Relief: for compensatory damages according to proof at trial; and for an award of punitive damages according to proof at trial.
- 3. On the Third Claim for Relief: for compensatory damages and/or restitution in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 4. On All Claims for Relief: for an Order certifying this action as a collective action pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure; for prejudgment and post-judgment interest at their respective maximum legal rates; for attorneys' fees and costs to the extent permitted by statute, contract, or in equity; and for any other or additional relief that the Court deems to be just and proper.

DATED: July 25, 2016 THEODORA ORINGHER PC

By:

Jon R. Mower, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**GABROY LAW OFFICES** 

By: Christia J. Gas.oy, Esc. Oscar Peralta, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1017785.1/81370.05002

DATED: July 25, 2016

#### DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiffs Kevin Carter, Michael Sacco, and Blake Reck for themselves and all similarly situated employees, hereby demand trial of these claims by jury to the extent authorized by law. DATED: July 25, 2016 THEODORA ORINGHER PC By: Jon R. Mower, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiffs DATED: July 25, 2016 **GABROY LAW OFFICES** By: hristian J. Gabroy, Esq. Oscar Peralta, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiffs 1017785.1/81370.05002 COMPLAINT



CONSENT TO JOINDER	
Carter, et al. v. Wynn Las Vegas,	LLC

By signing below I hereby consent to join this case Carter, et al. v. Wynn Las Vegas, LLC et al., as a plaintiff pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 216(b) and be represented by the attorneys Theodora Oringher PC, and GABROY LAW OFFICES pursuant to a written retainer agreement I have executed with them.

Date: 7/19/16 Signature: Miel Sc

YOU MUST ALSO EXECUTE A RETAINER FORM

Print Name: Middle

ORIGINAL OF THIS FORM SHOULD BE RETURNED TO:

Jon R. Mower, Esq.
THEODORA ORINGHER PC
535 Anton Blvd., Suite 900
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Septimorally apply the property of the

	7
	8
<b>スピック</b>	9
	10
<b>2</b> 8	11
) D	12
	13
<b>≥</b>	14
3	15
	16
	17
	18
	19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2

3

4

5

6

#### **CONSENT TO JOINDER** Carter, et al. v. Wynn Las Vegas, LLC

By signing below I hereby consent to join this case Carter, et al. v. Wynn Las Vegas, LLC et al., as a plaintiff pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 216(b) and be represented by the attorneys Theodora Oringher PC, and GABROY LAW OFFICES pursuant to a written retainer agreement I have executed with

Date: Signature: CAKTER Print Name: \_

YOU MUST ALSO EXECUTE A RETAINER FORM

ORIGINAL OF THIS FORM SHOULD BE RETURNED TO:

Jon R. Mower, Esq. THEODORA ORINGHER PC 535 Anton Blvd., Suite 900 Costa Mesa, CA 92626

## CONSENT TO JOINDER Carter, et al. v. Wynn Las Vegas, LLC

By signing below I hereby consent to join this case *Carter, et al.* v. *Wynn Las Vegas, LLC et al.*, as a plaintiff pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 216(b) and be represented by the attorneys Theodora Oringher PC, and GABROY LAW OFFICES pursuant to a written retainer agreement I have executed with them.

Date: 20 July 2016

Signature: Black

Print Name: BLAKE RECK

YOU MUST ALSO EXECUTE A RETAINER FORM

ORIGINAL OF THIS FORM SHOULD BE RETURNED TO:

Jon R. Mower, Esq. THEODORA ORINGHER PC 535 Anton Blvd., Suite 900 Costa Mesa, CA 92626

**IAFD** 1 **GABROY LAW OFFICES** Christian Gabroy (#8805) 2 Oscar Peralta (#13559) 3 The District at Green Valley Ranch 170 South Green Valley Parkway, Suite 280 4 Henderson, Nevada 89012 (702) 259-7777 Tel 5 Fax (702) 259-7704 CHRISTIAN@GABROY.COM 6 7 Jon R. Mower, Esq. Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice Pending 8 THEODORA ORINGHER PC 535 Anton Boulevard, Ninth Floor 9 Costa Mesa, California 92626-7109 (714) 549-6200 Tel 10 Fax (714) 549-6201 11 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF 12 13 DISTRICT COURT 14 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 15 KEVIN CARTER, MICHAEL SACCO, and 16

BLAKE RECK individually and on behalf of all persons similarly situated;

Case No. Dept.:

Plaintiffs,

VS.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

20

WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC, a Nevada

limited liability company,

Initial Appearance Fee Disclosure

Defendants.

Pursuant to NRS Chapter 19, filing fees are submitted for parties appearing in the above-captioned action as indicated below:

> Kevin Carter, Plaintiff \$270.00 Michael Sacco, Plaintiff \$30.00 \$30.00 Blake Reck, Plaintiff

Page 1 of 2

A-16-740621-C

## DISTRICT COURT CIVIL COVER SHEETXXVI I

Clark County, Nevada

	Case No. [Assigned by Clerk'	's Office)			
I. Party Information (provide both he		Marit property			
Plaintiff(s) (name/address/phone):	a miles of myterny	Defend	fendant(s) (name/address/phone):		
KEVIN CARTER, MICHAEL SACCO, and BLAKE RECK individually			WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability		
and on behalf of all others similarly sit		compa			
	COLONS	Compe	HIP		
		<del>- </del>			
Attorney (name/address/phone):		Attorno	W. Lagran Ind deaga Inhana N		
Gabroy Law Offices		Attorney (name/address/phone):			
170 S Green Valley Parkway, Suite 28	30	-			
Henderson, NV 89012		<del> </del>			
(702) 259-7777		1			
II. Nature of Controversy (please s Civil Case Filing Types	elect the one most applicable filing type	e below)			
Real Property			Torts		
Landlord/Tenant	Negligence		Other Torts		
Unlawful Detainer	Mauto		Product Liability		
Other Landlord/Tenant	Premises Liability		Intentional Misconduct		
Title to Property	Other Negligence		Employment Tort		
Judicial Foreclosure	Malpractice		Insurance Tort		
Other Title to Property	Medical/Dental		Other Tort		
Other Real Property	Legal				
Condemnation/Eminent Domain	Accounting				
Other Real Property Other Malpractice			Personal Property Control of the Con		
Probate	Construction Defect & Cont	ract	Judicial Review/Appeal		
Probate (select case type and estate value)	Construction Defect	1 11 1	Judicial Review		
Summary Administration	Chapter 40		Foreclosure Mediation Case		
General Administration	Other Construction Defect		Petition to Scal Records		
Special Administration	Contract Case		Mental Competency		
Set Aside	Uniform Commercial Code		Nevada State Agency Appeal		
Trust/Conservatorship	Building and Construction		Department of Motor Vehicle		
Other Probate	Insurance Carrier		Worker's Compensation		
Estate Value	Commercial Instrument		Other Nevada State Agency		
Over \$200,000			Appeal Other		
Between \$100,000 and \$200,000	Employment Contract		Appeal from Lower Court		
Under \$100,000 or Unknown	Other Contract		Other Judicial Review/Appeal		
Under \$2,500					
Civil Writ			Other Civil Filing		
Civil Writ			Other Civil Filing		
Writ of Habeas Corpus Writ of Prohibition			Compromise of Minor's Claim		
Writ of Mandamus Other Civil Writ			Foreign Judgment		
Writ of Quo Warrant			Other Civil Matters		
	ourt filings should be filed using the	e Busines	s Cot civil coversheet.		
			1111		
7/26/2016					
Date			Signature of initiating party or representative		

See other side for family-related case filings.